

Remarks

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action and the Advisory Action. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Section 103 Rejections

The Final Office Action rejects Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0023957 to Bau, III et al. ("*Bau*") in view of "LDAP Schema for UDDI" by Bergeson ("*Bergeson*"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Independent Claim 6, as amended, is allowable at least because the *Bau-Bergeson* combination proposed in the Final Office Action fails to disclose, expressly or inherently, "code for ... determining whether the at least one object is to be stored in the directory in a particular order in relation to other objects having an identical hierarchical level as the at least one object;" and "generating a second key that is monotonically increasing if it is determined that the at least one object is to be stored in the directory in the particular order, and if it is not determined that the at least one object is to be stored in the directory in the particular order, then generating a second key using a UUID (Universally Unique Identified) algorithm." The Office Action points to *Bau* as disclosing "a second key" of a previous version of Independent Claim 6. Whether or not this is correct, Applicants respectfully submit that *Bau* fails to disclose the limitations of amended Independent Claim 6. For example, although *Bau* discloses generating a conversation ID, *Bau* fails to disclose "code for ... determining **whether the at least one object is to be stored in the directory in a particular order in relation to other objects having an identical hierarchical level as the at least one object,**" let alone code for "generating a second key that is monotonically increasing **if it is determined that the at least one object is to be stored in the directory in the particular order,** and **if it is not determined that the at least one object is to be stored in the directory in the particular order,** then generating a second key using a UUID (Universally Unique Identified) algorithm," as is recited in Independent Claim 6 (emphasis added).

For at least this reason, Independent Claim 6 is allowable, as are Claims 8, 10, and 12 that depend therefrom. For an analogous reason, Independent Claim 1 is allowable, as are Claims 3, 5, and 11 that depend therefrom. Reconsideration and favorable action are requested.

New Claims 13 and 14

Applicants have added new Claims 13 and 14. Claims 13 and 14 each depend, either directly or indirectly, from Independent Claims 1 and 6, respectively. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to Independent Claims 1 and 6, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 13 and 14 are allowable. Favorable action is requested.

Conclusion


Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this case in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact Bradley P. Williams, the Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6447.

Applicants hereby take an extension of time for responding to the Final Office Action sent April 14, 2010 for one month from July 14, 2010 to August 14, 2010. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the one-month extension time in the amount of \$130.00 and any other necessary fees, or credit any overpayments to **Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.**

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Bradley P. Williams
Reg. No. 40,227

Date: August 13, 2010

Correspondence Address:

Customer Number:

05073